



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,167	08/24/2001	Raymond J. Werner	71062.P006X	4112
25943	7590	08/04/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204				VEILLARD, JACQUES
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2165		

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/939,167	WERNER, RAYMOND J.	
	Examiner Jacques Veillard	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 26-31 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 26-31 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the applicant's amendment filed on 4/21/2006.
2. Claims 26, 27, 29 have been amended, and claims 1-25 canceled.
3. Claims 26-31 are pending and presented for examination.

#### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-31 filed April 21, 2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### *Claim Objections*

5. Claims 26, 27 and 29 are objected to because of the following informalities: "bolding character" into the limitations of the claims is not accepted. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
7. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usami (U.S. Pat. No. 6,731,746) in view of Eintracht et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,687,878).

As per claim 26, Usami discloses an automatic sorting system for electronic telephone directory by providing a telephone directory to sort telephone numbers in the electronic

telephone directory prepares a calling information list which indicates an expected calling frequency in each day of the week and time period (See Usami Title and abstract). In particular, Usami discloses the claimed limitations of "receiving a directory listing command for listing computer files within the directory" (See Usami col.2, lines 11-60) the telephone directory taught by Usami may be associated with computer file since a computer is inherent in Usami system (See Usami Fig.1 and col.6, line 58 through col.7, line 49).

It is noted, however, Usami did not specifically disclose the feature of displaying a directory listing of computer files, wherein the directory listing of computer files includes time and time zone information associated with each of the computer files. On the other hand, Eintracht et al disclose a collaborative work systems suitable for use over a network(See Eintracht et al. Title and abstract) includes the feature of displaying a directory listing of computer files (See Eintracht et al. Fig.4 in conjunction with steps 96 and 98, and col.13, lines 6-34), wherein the directory listing of computer files includes time and time zone information associated with each of the computer files (See Eintracht et al. col. 9, line 61 through col.10, line 5; Fig.10, and col.16, line 65 through col.17, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant invention was made to modify the telephone directory teachings of Usami by incorporating the synchronization/updating system for collaborative document as taught by Eintracht et al. The motivation being to have enhanced the telephone directory of Usami by allowing it to display the telephone directory listing in time and time zone for different geographical areas by using a notes server enable to calculate the difference between its own clock and the client clock to obtain the

time zone of the client each time a notes synchronization is initiated at the client side (See Eintracht et al. col.9, line 61 through col.10, line 1).

As per claims 27 and 29, most of the claimed limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 26. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 26 above. In addition, the combination of Usami and Eintracht et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of "selecting a sorting order"(See Usami col.2, lines 15-25); sorting the directory listing in accordance with the sorting order (See Usami col.6, lines 17-55); and displaying the directory listing in accordance with the sorting order (See Eintracht et al. Fig.4 in conjunction with steps 96 and 98, and col.13, lines 6-34).

As per claim 28, most of the claimed limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 27. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 27 above. In addition, the combination of Usami and Eintracht et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of wherein the directory listing is sorted by time zone information(See Eintracht et al. col. 9, line 61 through col.10, line 5; Fig.10, and col.16, line 65 through col.17, line 10).

8. Claims 30 and 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usami in view of Eintracht et al.(U. S. Pat. 6,687,878) as applied to claim 29 above, and in further view Yamada et al.(U. S. Pat. 6,208,935).

As per claim 30, most of the claimed limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 29. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 29 above.

It is noted, however, the combination of Usami and Eintracht et al., as modified, did not specifically discloses the claimed limitations wherein the directory listing is sorted by specified regions. On the other hand, Yamada et al. achieved this claimed feature by providing a map application system wherein a contribution server returns an article with the relation to the position of the neighborhood according to the input of region name on a stroll terminal (See Yamada et al. abstract) includes the feature wherein the directory listing is sorted by specified regions (See Yamada et al. Fig.9, step 906, col.5, lines 8-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the automatic sorting system and method for electronic telephone directory of Usami by incorporating the longitude and latitude mechanism taught by Yamada et al. The motivation being to have enhanced the combination system of Usami and Eintracht et al. by allowing it to express the sorting of the telephone direction listing for a specified regions wherein the telephone calling classified quickly and efficiently by geographical areas.

As per claim 31, most of the claimed limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 29 and 30. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 29 and 30 above. In addition, the combination of Usami, Eintracht et al. and Yamada et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations wherein the specified regions comprises geographic areas defined by longitude and latitude information(See Yamada et al. (See Yamada et al. abstract, Fig.6, step 601, col.6, lines 22-37, and col.7, lines 12-20).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Other Prior Art Made Of Record***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will not be supplied with Office actions. Examiners advises the Applicant that the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. For the use of the Office's PAIR system, Applicants may refer to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197.

***Point Of Contact***

Art Unit: 2165

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (571) 272-4086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri. from 9 AM to 4:30 PM, alt. Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272- 4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JEFFREY GAFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

*J.V*  
*J.V*  
Jacques Veillard  
Patent Examiner TC 2100

August 01, 2006